UNITY

FREEDOM FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor 1880-1918)

Editors

John Haynes Holmes Francis Neilson

Ireland, Past and Present

By FRANCIS NEILSON

Social Justice

By H. G. CHANCELLOR

Wells's "Outline of History"

By DOROTHY BREWSTER

VOLUME LXXXVI NUMBER 18

Chicago, January 20, 1921

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

ESTABLISHED 1878

$3.00 PER ANNUM.

With THE FREE RELIGIOUS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, THE CONGRESS OF RELIGIONS, and all other organizations and individuals seeking to widen fellowship and to realize the Brotherhood of the Spirit unrimmed by creed, form or sectarian prejudices

EDITORS
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
FRANCIS NEILSON

ASSISTANT EDITOR
EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

Robert Collyer, Chicago. Wm. C. Gannett, St. Paul.
Jenkin Ll. Jones, Janesville. C. W. Wendte, Cincinnati.
J. C. Learned, St. Louis.

POBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

Frances L. Roberts, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. Sunderland, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
Geo. W. Cooke, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTORS
Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Charles W. Casson
George Willis Cooke
Percy M. Dawson
Frank C. Doan
Charles F. Dole
James Waldo Fawcett
Zona Gale
Emil G. Hirsch
Chester Lloyd Jones
David Starr Jordan
George Grover Mills
Susan M. Quackenbush
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
Albert R. Vail
Arthur L. Weatherly
James H. West

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Boulevard, CHICAGO, ILL.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

Sample Copies of UNITY Sent Upon Request

DREXEL State Bank

Cottage Grove Ave. *and* Oakwood Blvd.

Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor —large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .

Your savings and checking account cordially invited

Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

Contents:

EDITORIAL—

Notes.—J. H. H. 275
Ireland, Past and Present.—Francis Neilson 277

CONTRIBUTED—

Social Justice.—*H. G. Chancellor* 280
A Memorial to Jenkin Lloyd Jones 284
Wells's "Outline of History."—Dorothy Brewster 284

POETRY—

Sons of Promise.—Thomas Curtis Clark 275
Waves.—*Louise Townsend Nicholl* 280
Onward.—*Florence Earle Coates* 280

THE FIELD—

The Association to Abolish War 287
The Lynching Record for 1920 288

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

Vol. LXXXVI THURSDAY, JANUARY 20, 1921 Number 18

SONS OF PROMISE.

In every meanest face I see
A perfected humanity;
All men, though brothers of the clod,
Bear promise of the sons of God.

No human ore that does not hold
A precious element of gold;
No heart so blackened and debased
But has for Him some treasure chaste.

THOMAS CURTIS CLARK.

Bernard Shaw is right! The policy of the Allies, since the armistice, has been "an orgy of blackguardism." What is worse, it still continues as such an orgy! The betrayal of Germany in the denial of "the fourteen points" at Versailles, the deliberate murder of Austria, the abandoning of Hungary to rape at the hands of Roumania, the surrender of Shantung to Japan, the lustful struggle for control in Syria, Mesopotamia and Persia, the deliberate backing of the bloody ruffianism of swashbuckling Poland, the massacre by starvation and disease of nameless millions in Russia through the horror of the blockade—these are but so many conspicuous items in a long catalogue of abominations that besmears the Allies with eternal infamy. Of Germany's policies during the progress of the War, it is impossible to say too much in condemnation. But all that she did, caused no more missery and death, and was no more hideously immoral, than the policies of the Allies since the War was ended. We have heard that it has been said that victors do themselves honor by display of magnanimity, forbearance, generosity, forgiveness, and sweet charity. Of such honor, the victors in the Great War gained not a shred. Their achievement was to outdo in cruelty the enemy whom they had conquered.

It is a wonderful thing these days to see some of our most famous and influential military leaders come out flat-footedly in favor of disarmament. It was only a few weeks ago that General Tasker Bliss in an address in Philadelphia stirred the nation by denouncing the philosophy of preparedness, describing armies and navies as provocations to war, and appealing for their abolition as a condition of enduring peace. Now comes General Pershing, most distinguished of all American soldiers, with the same message. "It would appear," he says, "that the lessons of the past six years should be enough to convince everybody of the danger of nations striding up and down the earth armed to the teeth." It is to be noted here that Pershing speaks not of any single nation but of "nations." This is plainly enough a direct reference to the condition of armed preparedness in all European countries in the days before the outbreak of the Great War, and a deliberate admission of the charge that it was the competitive armaments of all these nations and not merely the aggressive militarism of Germany which precipitated the cataclysm of 1914. Turning from the past to the future, the General declared an "important step" toward preventing the recurrence of international wars "would be to curtail expenditures for the maintenance of navies and armies." This, of course, is a direct appeal to the conscience of America, for it is this country alone which is refusing to curtail such expenditures and is thus setting a new pace of competitive armaments. Under these circumstances, it is gratifying to know that General Pershing's plea was greeted by the great audience to which it was addressed with "tremendous applause." The day of the pacifist has now come. Think of what a whirligig of time is here when the heresy of anti-preparedness, long characteristic of the pacifist point of view, has become the outspoken doctrine of the man who commanded and led to victory the army which fought under the American flag on the battlefields of Flanders.

To what extent is the prevailing and ever-increasing unemployment in this country due not to natural but to artificial causes? Thousands of men, of course, have lost their positions because of the slump which has come in many fields of industrial activity, but is there not something more than a strong possibility that in addition to these there are many thousands of other men who have been forced out of employment by the deliberate action of the leaders of business? Signs are multiplying that capital has already launched a campaign for the abolition of the closed shop, collective bargaining and other improved conditions of labor, which have been won after many years of sacrifice and high endeavor. One of the obvious necessities of such a campaign is the artificial creation of a labor surplus which leaves the business man free to determine his own terms of employment. We have been informed, for example, of one concern in New York City which has been discharging twenty-five men on each Saturday night for a long period of weeks. This does not mean that the firm is not doing as much business to-day as formerly. On the contrary, each Monday morning following the discharge of the fated twenty-five, a fresh batch of twenty-five men is employed

to fill their empty posts. The new men, of course, are taken on at a reduced wage, at longer hours, and they are all of them non-union. To what extent this sort of thing is going on, no man can say. It is probable, however, that such a drive on labor for the purpose of destroying the conditions secured especially during the war period, explains a large share of the unemployment that now prevails. At a time when we are being taught by authorities high and low that the strike is a crime against the public interests, it might be well to learn also that the lock-out and even the labor overturn, is no less a crime. The minimum of unemployment due to the prevailing reaction in business the world round, is serious enough, without its being deliberately multiplied for unworthy ends.

A teacher in a well-known private school in New York City has given us some facts of amazing interest as regards the question of the soundness and vitality of our faith in democracy. This teacher has in her school a class of pupils who have been segregated from the rest of the school because of their exceptional mental ability, as tested by the familiar Binet methods. These children have "intelligence quotient" records of between 140 to 171. This means that, at ten years of life-age, they average from fourteen to seventeen years of mental-age. These pupils as listed include: (1) "a liberal cultured Jew, home of modest comfort"; (2) "a boy of Negro descent, a sociological not ethnological Negro, since he is lighter than (his teacher)"; (3) "boy of lower East Side, orthodox Jew, father a brilliant rising young physician"; (4) "boy, son of rich uptown doctor, Gentile"; (5) "child of East Side tenements, born in Austria, parents speak no English, child's clothing ragged, face often dirty, father beginning to push up to success, orthodox Jew"; (6) "daughter of very orthodox Episcopalian, Y. M. C. A. leader, limited means"; (7) "son of very wealthy manufacturer, liberal Jews, cultured people"; (8) "son of Roumanian peasants, ignorant but very intelligent, thrifty and successful, renegade Jews"; (9) "fairly dark Negro, grandparents Oberlin students"; (10) "idolized baby in Jewish home of great wealth"; (11) "son of radical thinker of moderate means, Jewish"; (12) "son of Russian Jewish socialists, very poor indeed, quite the 'Red' type, disgruntled with everything, parents have both worked through poverty, dirt, and disorder to get Ph. D's. at Columbia"; (13) "son of a radical poet, a fair degree of wealth"; (14) "daughter of poor but successful doctor of lower East Side"; (15) "son of rich manufacturer, Jewish"; (16) "son of progressive public school principal, liberal Jews"; (17) "daughter of a merchant of moderate means, Jewish." We count this a remarkable record! Here in this segregated group of exceptional children are rich and poor, Gentile and Jew, black and white, orthodox and liberal, American, Austrian, Roumanian and Russian. Surely this is a vindication of democracy. We wonder also if it does not have direct bearing on the proposal now being agitated in Washington for the restriction or stoppage altogether of immigration.

A lively discussion has recently been running in the London *Nation* on the spiritual state of the Nonconformist Churches. Those who contend that, during and since the War, these churches have been faithless to their traditional ideals of liberty, and are now in a state of utter demoralization, seem to have much the better of the argument. A letter from a Mr. John H. Lees, of Rugby, published in the December 11th issue of the *Nation,* sums up the facts in the situation with impressive vigor. Pointing out that he "ceased to attend the local Free Church Council" more than "eighteen months ago," Mr. Lees declares that, in spite of occasional fidelities here and there, the Nonconformist Churches are open to the most serious charges of infidelity. The case against them, he says, is "unassailable." . . .

> Taken as a whole, the temper of our Nonconformist Churches in these years of trial has been lamentable. It has been, indeed, nothing less than a betrayal. I speak as one who has felt all along that we could do no other than enter the war. But with that understood, it seems to me that the whole task of Nonconformity lay in seeing that those principles of individual liberty and reverence for the conscience of each man, which have always been recognized as the very breath of our life, should be kept inviolate amidst all the violence and clamor of war. But the Nonconformist Church of the average sort became the most uncomfortable of all places for the pacifist and conscientious objector; and the witness of our distinctive principles passed out of our churches very largely into the hands of men like the brothers Cecil. One of our leading Nonconformist weeklies outrivaled the *Morning Post* in the militarism of its tone, and the *Baptist Times* went so far as to show that the Peace Treaty squared in all its main provisions with the Fourteen Points.
>
> The later phases of our decadence are due as much as anything to the fact that when the great political *coup* of 1916 was effected, because it happened to be a Baptist Prime Minister who issued out of it as the chief participant, all the moral recklessness of it was ignored, and Mr. Lloyd George was taken to Nonconformity's heart. So it happens that leading Free Churchmen can ask the Prime Minister to take the leading part at the leading "Mayflower" celebrations at a time when the Government are watching one who, in the days to come, will be included among the greatest martyrs of the race, starve to death. But, of course, it was conscience in the case of the men of the "Mayflower," and only stupidity and folly in the case of the Irishman. Later a juster view will be given even by Nonconformists themselves, and Mr. McSwiney will be given a greater honor than the men of the "Mayflower." But at present all that Nonconformity appears to be able to do is to celebrate past martyrs to liberty and do nothing toward preventing present martyrs.

This is wholesome talk—and heartening too! For it shows that in the case of one man at least, and probably of many more, Nonconformity is not yet dead!

Evidences of the commercialization of Christianity are so abundant and convincing that one no more thinks of mentioning them than of mentioning the air we breathe. Every now and then, however, there

comes along a bit of testimony which is as unescapeable of attention as a bad smell. For example, there was preached at St. Paul's cathedral church in Boston, during the past summer, by Dr. Edward T. Sullivan, rector of Trinity Episcopal Church in Newton Center, a sermon on missions and missionaries which is an example of this kind. In his discourse, Dr. Sullivan pointed out at great length and with detailed illustration, that the missionary is a pioneer of trade, a man who knows how to sell goods. "It is the missionary," says this modern apostle of the Nazarene, "who has taught millions of savages to demand our modern commercial articles in ever increasing quantities." It is the missionary who is responsible for the rubber trade in the African Congo—a fact which we confess we had never thought before to place to the credit of Christianity! Bishop Brent's great achievement in the Philippines, we learn, was the starting of the white cotton trade with the Igorotes.

"By raising the savages' standards of life," says Dr. Sullivan, "the missionary creates a demand for modern conveniences. . . . The missionary sets up a complete household; the natives see him and his family wearing clothes, eating from dishes, sleeping on beds, and doing a hundred other things which at first excite their curiosity and later their ambition to do likewise. An order from the missionary for articles to satisfy the wants of his charges, starts the ball rolling. Once it is under way, the merchant back in America, or England, or Germany, rolls it to the utmost; but do not forget that it was the missionary who started it."

Who can doubt now that the church is the friend of capitalism? How can "big business" ignore the claims of the church for financial support? It is true, of course, as Dr. Sullivan points out, in deference, we suppose, to certain old-fashioned prejudices, "that primarily the missionary (to the heathen) has sought to Christianize and raise their moral and social codes." Exactly!—this is not to be forgotten! *But*—"in the process he has become a first-class business man." Here is achievement indeed! The Psalmist's *coup* in persuading Righteousness and Peace to kiss each other, is here outdone by the alliance of God and Mammon!

The work of church consolidation goes merrily on! Some months ago the City of Brooklyn was dumbfounded by the announcement that two of its most famous and influential churches—the Central Congregational, Dr. S. Parks Cadman, minister, and the Clinton Avenue Congregational, Dr. Nehemiah Boynton, minister—had voted to unite their forces. Now comes the even more startling news that the First Reformed Episcopal Church, located in Manhattan, has agreed to unite with the Beekman Hill Methodist Episcopal Church in the same Borough of Greater New York. These consolidations are hailed by the newspapers and the religious press as evidence of the growing spirit of inter-church fraternity, and a recognition of true business standards in the limitation of the waste incident to needless competition. We recognize that these are important aspects of this modern development in church life. We think it foolish, however, to close our eyes to the fact that this constant combining of two or more churches into a single church, is evidence also of the waning power of the church as a social institution, and its growing failure to command the allegiance and support of the people. Twenty years ago it would have been inconceivable that these two Congregational churches in Brooklyn, should unite, not because competition between them was keen and their public activities a duplication of effort, but because each one was filled with people, and therefore doing all the work in its own parish that it could possibly handle. The same thing is true of the Manhattan churches. Brooklyn and Manhattan are both larger by many hundreds of thousands of people than they were a generation ago; and yet we witness the constant tendency to reduce the number of churches, each newly combined institution being no larger in itself than any one of the separate institutions which it has displaced. In the face of such events as these, how foolish it is for complacent denominational officials to talk of "the growth of the church"! The great need of the situation to-day is honest men who will see facts as they are, trace them to their sources, and undertake a reconstruction of religious organization which will represent a true adjustment of the spiritual forces of our own time, at work in the hearts of men. We shall have a genuine revival of religion only when the denominational church is once and for all abandoned, and the new social or community church established in its place.

Ireland, Past and Present

A few days ago a Chicago paper published the first of the photographs of the ruin and destruction caused by the armed forces of the British Government in Ireland. The picture was not one of the most startling of the long series that has been published in such British newspapers as the *Manchester Guardian* and the *London Daily News*, but it undoubtedly showed that whatever destructive practices the Germans were guilty of in Flanders and Northern France, the troops operating under the Lloyd George-Greenwood Government left nothing to be desired by the most thoroughgoing militarist. It was, however, refreshing to see this picture in our prints, for there had been a kind of conspiracy of silence in respect to illustrating what was taking place in Ireland. Whether it be possible to shock our people out of their apathy and indifference to the havoc and rapine inflicted by the Black-and-Tans in Ireland is a moot question, for the people have been surfeited during the past six years with horror portrayed in the prints and on the screen. Perhaps this is the reason there are no drives for funds in support of the Irish people whose suffering for a

century at least has been paralleled only by the excesses inflicted by the imperial armies of Rome upon the peoples of the Pontine. The four-minute man is out of commission on this question and the pulpits of the land are paralyzed. Yet in England comparisons are freely drawn by men of eminence with the stories of the outrage perpetrated upon Belgium. Indeed the reports of the debates in the House of Commons reveal a state of affairs in Ireland such as war itself never equalled in modern times. The last man in the world to lay himself open to a charge of exaggeration is Henry W. Nevinson—probably the best known British war correspondent—who has recently returned from a tour through Ireland. He has seen for himself the terrible destruction of Irish villages, the ruins of the people's shops and houses, the utterly destroyed creameries and co-operative stores where the people have been shot down and their buildings burnt out by the troops of Generals Macready and Tudor. In referring to the work of these unrestrained "Auxiliaries," Nevinson says:

> I do not know who imagines himself in control of these Auxiliaries on such occasions. The men are supposed to be all ex-officers. General Tudor, in a letter calling for more recruits, has called them a *corps d'élite,* and said their object was to relieve the Irish people from terror of the pistol. With this object they swagger about the streets brandishing revolvers, threatening men with death for a mere word or for having their hands in their pockets, robbing tills, and taking whips from car-drivers to lash the passers-by. If this is a *corps d'élite* formed from ex-officers, God help our army! In thirty years' fairly intimate acquaintance with the British army, I have never seen officers like these. What more they acquire I cannot say, but many of them behave more like a gang of bandits let loose upon a poor and distracted country than like the British officers to whom I have hitherto been accustomed.

This is a very shocking statement for anyone to make, but to be made by a man of Nevinson's calibre it hurts dreadfully those who believe in the essential qualities of the British people. Nevertheless it is in the nature of a revelation of the change that this war has brought about. Butchery has somehow or other got under the skin of tens of thousands of people that have become inured to the horrors of carnage, and anarchy seems everywhere to be supplanting order and discipline. The statement of Cardinal Logue in his pastoral letter of a few weeks ago in which he deals with conditions in Ireland is to the point:

> Lorries laden with armed men career through the country day by day, and when the unhappy people seek cover or fly, as one naturaly would when a cry is raised of a mad dog at large, or a savage beast escaped from a menagerie, that flight is taken as sufficient proof of guilt, and they are pitilessly shot down at sight. No false pretences, no misrepresentations, no pall of lies, even though they were as dark as Erebus, can screen or conceal the guilt of such proceedings from anyone who knows and can weigh the facts.

The horror of the work of the "Auxiliaries" and the Black-and-Tans can scarcely be appreciated by a people that is removed by 3,000 miles, and the stories that reach this country that are not given to the press and the platform by a publicity department, such as we had in Washington during the war, are so shocking that human folk put them away as gross exaggerations and the coinage of a vindictive partisan anxious only to blacken the name of his opponent. Mr. Nevinson, however, is a reliable reporter and he says:

> What may be the Government's intentions with regard to the Irish nation, I cannot tell. Officers have told me that it is the intention to blockade and devastate the whole country, collecting the women and children into concentration camps, as was done in the Transvaal and Orange Free State during the Boer War. I cannot say. But I do know something about the present condition of the people under our Government's methods. Martial law and open war could hardly make it more pitiable. Cardinal Logue's comparison is exact. The people live as though a mad dog might spring upon them at any minute and from any corner. It is a life of perpetual fear and strain. No man who has any sympathy with the national cause (one of the causes for which we were told the Great War was fought) can regard his property or his life as secure from evening to morning. No woman can regard her home as safe. It is safer to take the children for refuge to the bogs and mountains. The children cannot sleep at night. Doctors tell me that St. Vitus's Dance and other nervous affections are terribly on the increase among the young. Men, women, and children, against whom there is no proof or charge or even suspicion of guilt in any kind, are insulted, humiliated, and brutally treated. To my mind the insolence and scorn which will prompt armed men to thrash passers-by with whips as a joke, or to compel them to kneel in the mud and take the oath of allegiance at the revolver's point, or to sing "God Save the King" under compulsion in a cinema, reveal a lower depth of degradation in our Government's agents than the more violent "reprisals" of pillage, arson, and murder. I am convinced that such outrages will sink more deeply into the hearts and memories of a people who assuredly will never abandon their hope of deliverance from a Government that thus afflicts them. To put it

from our own English side, what pleasure can the King have in oaths of allegiance thus extracted, or in anthems thus sung for his salvation? Of one thing at least I am certain: whatever martial law may accomplish, or discussions on truce suggest, there can be no possible hope of peace or of truce until, as the first step, the Auxiliaries and Black-and-Tans are withdrawn or disarmed, and such arms as may still be thought necessary are limited to Irish police who have some feeling for their countrymen, and to regular troops who have some respect for their officers and the honour of our English name.

Suppose such a statement as that had been made about the Germans in Belgium during the war by a correspondent as reliable as Mr. Nevinson. Immediately a wave of horror would have shaken the thoughtful people of the world and their indignation would scarcely have known bounds, but as it is made about the British troops in Ireland it will leave the vast majority of the people of the United States cold. It is amazing how our non-Irish population have remained dumb to the terrible appeal of the Irish people in their affliction. Now that the conditions in Ireland have reached a stage in the progress of brutality which exceeds anything that has ever been recorded, it might be well for us to remind ourselves of the conditions that existed a generation or more ago and turn to the statements of eminent British politicians and authors to whom the Irish question was in the nature of a sham and a disgrace. Froude, the historian, said, "With the government in Ireland, 'the gallows is the only preacher of righteousness.'" Lord John Russell said, "*We* have made Ireland—I speak it deliberately—*we* have made it the most degraded and miserable country in the world. All the world is crying shame upon us, but we are equally callous to our ignominy and to the results of our misgovernment." Lord John Russell should have known what he was talking about for he had been Prime Minister of England. In quoting Godkin, whose name should be remembered by all intelligent Americans of middle life, I would point out that the passage I have taken from his book "Land War in Ireland" is not unlike Mr. Nevinson's description of the affairs of to-day. Godkin says:

In this self-defensive war, they (the Irish) cannot cope with the armed power of England in the open field; and they are driven upon the criminal resource of the oppressed in all ages and all lands—secret combination. They feel no remorse; first, because it is *war*—just as the soldier feels no remorse for killing the enemy in a battle; and, secondly, because their conquerors, and the successors of those conquerors, have taught them too well, by repeated examples, the terrible lesson of making light of human life. Poor, ignorant creatures, they cannot see that, while the most illustrious noblemen in England won applause and honours by shooting down Irish women and children like seals or otters, the survivors of the murdered people should be execrated as cruel, barbarous, and infamous for shooting the men that pull down the roof-trees over the heads of their helpless families, and trample upon their household gods.

Benjamin Disraeli's description, written in 1874, almost perfectly describes what is going on to-day. He said, "Neither liberty of the press nor liberty of the person exists in Ireland. Arrests are at all times liable. It is a fact that at any time in Ireland the police may enter into your house, examine your papers to see if there is any resemblance between the writing and that of some anonymous letter that has been sent to a third person. In Ireland, if a man writes an article in a newspaper and it offends the Government, he has a warning, and if he repeats the offense his paper may be suppressed." In the Coercion Bill Debate of 1866 John Bright said, "You may pass this (Coercion) Bill; you may put men in jail; you may suppress conspiracy; but the moment it is suppressed there will still remain the germs of the malady, and from those germs will grow up, as heretofore, another crop of disaffection—another harvest of misfortunes. And those members of this House—younger it may be than I am—who may be here eighteen years hence may find another Ministry proposing to them another administration of the same ever-failing and poisonous medicine."

Then to quote from General Gordon's famous letter to the *London Times* is to be reminded of one of the most scathing indictments of a government that was ever penned by a great soldier. Gordon said, "I must say from all accounts and from my own observation that the state of our fellow countrymen in the parts I have named is worse than that of any people in the world, let alone Europe. I believe these people are made as we are, that they are patient beyond belief, loyal, but at the same time broken-spirited and desperate, living on the verge of starvation in places in which we would not keep our cattle. The Bulgarians, Anatolians, Chinese, and Indians are better off than many of them are." It is, however, John Stuart Mill in the House of Commons during a debate on Ireland that put the whole thing in a nutshell. He said, "The Irish circumstances and the Irish ideas as to social and agricultural economy are the general ideas and the circumstances of the human race. It is the English ideas and circumstances that are peculiar. Ireland is in the main stream of human existence and human feeling and opinion. It is England that is in one of the lateral channels."

In conclusion, another parallel may be drawn, and Ireland is of course the question of all questions where

parellels of all kinds can easily be found, but in this one there is a peculiarity to be mentioned that the Irish question of to-day has made the *London Times* of Lord Northcliffe echo with the sentiment of the *Times* when it was *The Thunderer* and stood for all that was noble and rational in English aspiration. This is what the *London Times* of February 25, 1847, had to say:

> The people of England have most culpably connived at a national iniquity. Property ruled with savage and tyrannical sway. It exercised its rights with a hand of iron, and renounced its duties with a front of brass. The "fat of the land, the flower of its wheat," its "milk and its honey," flowed from its shores in tribute. It was all drain and no return. But if strength and industry fared but ill in a land where Capital was in perpetual flux and decay, how much more poverty and weakness? In an integral part of the British Empire, on the soil trodden by a British sovereign, the landowner was allowed to sweep away the produce of the earth without leaving even a gleaning for them that were ready to perish. And they did perish year by year continually from sheer destitution. England stupidly winked at this tyranny. Ready enough to vindicate political rights, it did not avenge the poor. It is now paying for that connivance.

This brief review of the situation in Ireland may very well end here for England (the Government) is stupidly winking at this tyranny and is paying for the connivance. Perhaps this time it may pay in full.

FRANCIS NEILSON.

WAVES.

One by one upon my shore
  The little waves are laid,
Each one a new and perfect thing
  Which the sea has made.

From that which is forever old
  They come, forever young,
The latest, faintest echoes
  Of the song the sea has sung.

They echo it in whispers.
  I listen ceaselessly,
For fear the echoes die away
  And I should hear the sea.

Poetry. —*Louise Townsend Nicholl.*

ONWARD.

Thank God a man can grow!
  He is not bound
With earthward gaze to creep along the ground:
Though his beginnings be but poor and low,
Thank God a man can grow!
The fire upon his altars may burn dim,
  The torch he lighted may in darkness fail,—
  And nothing to rekindle it avail,—
But high beyond his dull horizon's rim,
Arcturus and the Pleiads beckon him!

The Atlantic. —*Florence Earle Coates.*

CONTRIBUTED

Social Justice

By

H. G. Chancellor, Ex-Member of Parliament for Haggerston, Eng.

"That which is altogether just shalt thou follow, that thou mayest live, and inherit the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee."—DEUT. XVI:20.

What is justice? It is the opposite of privilege. Privilege consists in the possession of opportunity with power to deny opportunity to others. Every human life is just a bundle of possibilities. Every human being is born with its own inherent capacities, capable of development and perfectibility, but liable to suppression or perversion. Right development is possible only by the right use of opportunity. Neglect of opportunity, whether in the material or the spiritual sphere, means failure. Denial of opportunity, whether by state or by individual, means injustice. The measure of injustice existing in any state of society is the measure of its failure as a social organism. For obviously a social organism that prevents its organs from developing and functioning in the way nature intended fails, just as does the animal organism that loses some of its powers through the non-use of limbs or of faculties which in time disappear or become useless. In the animal world there are many cases of such failure resulting in degeneration and even extinction.

Society is something more and other than the sum of the individuals who compose it. It is that, but it is also the organization of their relations to one another, in recognition of their mutual dependence and obligations. In the evolution of those relations, churches, municipalities, states, and the many other institutions through which groups act together to supply their religious, educational, economic and political needs, have come into existence. These institutions are the outcome of the natural desire for association and co-operation ingrained in human beings.

The first law of nature is self-preservation, the second self-realization. That applies to society and to the individuals composing society. In seeking self-preservation and self-realization human beings are obeying the law of their being, whether acting individually or collectively. But in doing this the most awful mistakes have been made, and mankind have blundered in darkness through aeons, slowly learning by calamity and suffering, and then forgetting and going again through the same process.

Obviously, if God has endowed His children with gifts and capacities this must have been that they should be developed and used. I cannot conceive of their being purposeless, or in themselves baneful. Nor do I believe that any one of them is other than a means to secure the happiness and well being of the individual possessing it. That is true not only of the things that elevate, but also of the things that degrade. When they do that the mistake is not His, but man's. Hunger and thirst are healthful when appeased in accordance with the laws of health; but when indulged to the extent of gluttony and drunkenness they lead to disease. The sexual impulse is not only right but necessary to the perpetuation of the race; but when indulged against the moral law it leads to moral degeneration and often physical destruction. Anger di-

rected against wrong leads to its avoidance and abatement; whilst directed against fellow creatures it leads to violence and suffering. Self interest sought in industry and production contributes to the well-being of the individual and of his fellows; but pursued in disregard of the rights of others and at their expense it develops the vice of selfishness and leads to all sorts of crime and injury.

Even the love of beauty and of knowledge pursued to the exclusion of everything else, may turn a man into a mere artist, or into a ghoul inflicting intolerable suffering upon helpless animals. The best gifts, therefore are capable of mis-use, and the worst, if there be worst, capable, rightly used, of contributing to the sum of human attainment and happiness.

The secret of true success in making of life what God intended it to be is found in using his gifts in obedience to His laws. Some of these laws are written in men's hearts; others have to be learned by experience, observation, deduction and demonstration.

Such progress as mankind has made has been due to knowledge so gained and used rightly. But even knowledge, perverted to wrong uses, is a curse rather than a blessing. As witness the devastated areas of war-stricken Europe, where it has blotted out whole towns, destroyed countless lives, and inflicted suffering and misery on vast populations.

Now if these human gifts are for man's use in contributing to his own and his fellows' well-being, physical and spiritual, it is his duty and privilege to overcome or to remove conditions that prevent their development and use, or cause their perversion to hurtful or debasing purposes. This is so not only for his own well-being, but for that of the society of which he is a unit. And if he owes this as a duty to society, society owes a similar duty to him, not only for its own, but also for his sake. The obligation is mutual, so is the benefit.

In many forms of social organization into which men enter *voluntarily* this is recognized. Every member joining and complying with the conditions is entitled to the same rights as every other member. There are inequalities, and rightly so. But these are due to moral causes. The one who renders greater service receives greater reward. But this does not take the form of power to curtail the rights of other members. On the contrary it takes the form of putting him into positions calling for greater service to them and thus enlarging their rights. The loyal and zealous or specially gifted member earns the confidence of his fellows, and is elected to committees or sub-committees, placed in office as chairman or president, and his reward is "the glory of going on" working and thinking for them and receiving their affection and approbation. Thus the gifts and graces of all the members are engaged in a competition to realize themselves in service, which competition is the more beneficial to each and to all, the more active it is. Suppression or discouragement of any one member is a detriment not only to that one but to the whole. The well-being of the individual is involved in that of the whole, the well-being of the whole in that of the individual; and any service rendered is one whose benefits he cannot help sharing with every other member. He can best benefit himself by benefiting them, and his right to self-expression and realization is limited only where its exercise takes a form that would limit the equal right of other members. That is social justice realized within the range of life covered by such an organization, be it society or club or association or lodge or chapter.

But in society as a whole in which individuals *must* live, this principle of mutuality does not obtain, except within narrow limits. Here, in far greater degree, competition exists; but normally it is directed to far different ends. The struggle for existence forces men to study their own interests first and always, and to pursue these at the expense of others. The workman seeking a job knows that his getting it lessens the chance of some other workman. But he must live and his dependents, whether others do or not. Hence he fights for the job and lets others go to the wall. The same applies to the business man seeking orders. Incidentally these cannot escape the law of service. For normally the more efficient get the work or the business by producing better work or by meeting better the needs of customers, through greater application or better insight into those needs. But service is not the aim. It is personal gain, and service only as a means to that end. And the kind of success the world admires is the acquisition of wealth, which is only possible, not by serving others, but by making them serve you.

This is true even where competition is modified by co-operation. Trade Unions exist to promote the welfare of their members. Their aims are to raise wages and improve conditions and insure employment for them all. But to do this they deliberately limit their membership and try to prevent the employment in similar work of all outside their ranks. I am not blaming them, but merely stating the well-known fact. Under existing conditions no other policy seems possible. The aim is to get the largest wage for the smallest service by shutting off that means of life from all but themselves.

In business circles co-operation takes the form of amalgamations of capital to secure monopoly of trade and exclude competition for the sake of greater profits. The public exists not to be served but to be exploited. That is the aim. And though exploitation is only possible through service, that unescapable condition is merely incidental, and the service is as small and the charge for it as high as "the traffic will bear."

These forms of co-operation, therefore, only substitute the selfishness of a section or class for that of the individual, and benefit the section at the expense of the community.

Now the individual engaged in pursuit of self-interest is often the one also engaged in unselfish service to his church or club. In both he is realizing himself. Why should he find satisfaction alike in preying on fellow-creatures in one capacity and in sacrificing himself for them in the other? The difference is not in the individual. The same personality, the same physical and mental powers are engaged in both. And in the main the purpose, too, is the same, viz., to get out of life the best it is capable of giving. But the results are widely different. On the one hand is blessing without bane, because all share in it, the only inequality being that the one who renders greatest service enjoys the greatest share. On the other hand the accumulation of great wealth by the few involves widespread poverty of the many, with all that it means of moral debasement at both extremes, and of hunger, suffering and wearing anxiety at the one.

The difference is in the conditions. Wherein lies this difference? Simply in this. In the case of the

voluntary organization, within its own limits social justice obtains. In the case of the community it is denied. Social justice within any society is simply equality of opportunity for the self-realization and self-determination of every constituent member. Not equality of gifts, whether physical or mental or spiritual. These belong to the individual and are born with him. Nature decides in each case what they shall be, and in so doing determines the possibilities that inhere in each man and woman. If these possibilities are not realized in any life, the purpose for which that life was given is so far frustrated. . . .

Now is there a cause, one that is not merely contributory or incidental, but fundamental? And if so is that cause removable? Or does the natural structure of society involve the suppression of individual self-realization? If so this age-long denial of freedom must go on. You cannot break a law of nature, whether physical, moral or economic. You can only disobey it, and then it will break you. The effects may be modified, but whilst the cause remains they cannot be prevented. The trouble is that all so-called reforms hitherto have dealt with effects and left the fundamental cause untouched. The fundamental need of human beings is food, without which they must perish. Then come shelter and clothing, and after these the things needed for the satisfaction of other human wants and desires. All these things are forms of wealth. Society can only live by the production and distribution of wealth. Man must die if he has not enough wealth to sustain life, and suffer if his supply is not sufficient to meet his reasonable wants. Except for infants and physical and mental deficients every person is normally capable of providing for his needs, and in co-operation with others a surplus for exchange. If free to use his powers in production no man or woman need starve. But millions are not free to do this. They can only do it by permission of others who possess that form of wealth called capital, which enables them to command the lion's share of what workers produce, by denying to them the opportunity to produce except on these terms. Hence to many capitalism is the cause of social injustice, with all its evil consequences in unmerited poverty and suffering. The only remedy, they say, is common ownership of wealth and its equal distribution to individuals. But would common ownership give liberty? It would involve regimentation of the whole population under intricate rules and regulations that would make life a burden and self direction impossible. Reward not proportioned to effort would encourage the slacker and discourage the energetic. The denial of possession of the fruit of his labor would atrophy the creative impulse to which is due mainly such material progress as society has made since emerging from savagery. In the absence of penal discipline amounting to slavery, production would almost certainly decrease and general starvation be much more likely than general comfort.

And after all, is capitalism, i.e., the ownership of capital by individuals, the real cause of poverty. Capital is that part of wealth produced which, instead of being consumed at the time, is used to make the production of more wealth easier by assisting labor to produce it. Besides this, it is perishable, and would disappear unless constantly used. Its very existence depends on that. Without labor the owner would soon cease to be a capitalist, for he would be reduced to consuming it until it was gone. The capitalist qua capitalist could not exploit labor. He could only assist labor, which is his proper and natural function. Henry George pointed out long ago that capital does not employ labor, but labor employs capital. To the man who is free to provide his own livelihood the fact that his neighbor owns more wealth than he has no terrors. The fact is irrelevant so far as his own liberty is concerned. And borrowing at interest, so far from exploiting him, enables him by exploiting capital to make his own effort more profitable, unless he is under obligation to hand over to the lender the profit of his work beyond the interest itself. Within that limit the benefit is mutual. Capital and labor co-operate. They are not enemies but comrades. Each makes life better for the other.

It is in the power to enforce the obligation referred to that the evil exists which is attributed to capitalism. But this is due to another element altogether. That element is the control, not of capital or of any other form of wealth, but of the things from which wealth is made, without which capital and labor are alike helpless. These are the materials and forces that inhere in land and sea, the soil, the minerals, the clays, the rocks and slate mountains, the rivers and waterfalls, and the thousand natural resources that enter into the composition of wealth or provide the means and forces for its manufacture and transport.

If these are held by individuals to the exclusion of others, the others can be held to ransom or starved into submission by denial of the only means by which they live. In themselves natural resources are not wealth. They only become wealth when labor, whether with or without the assistance of capital, has made them available for human use to meet human need. And the value is added to with every fresh process of manufacture.

Iron ore left unused in the ground might as well not be there, but when brought to the surface it has already been turned by labor into a commodity, to whose value labor adds at every stage as it is transported to the smelting furnace, thence to the rolling mills, the engineering shops, and finally turned out as a locomotive.

The building plot kept vacant is useless, but when made available for its natural economic purpose, that of building, it may prove to be a means for producing or accumulating untold wealth. Now if these things, the iron ore and the building site, were capital, the owners could only conserve by using them. Failing that they would deteriorate and perish, inflicting irreparable loss. By economic law, i.e., by the nature of capital, its owner is driven to avoid ruin and loss by investing it, i.e., by lending it to labor, which uses it on raw materials to produce wealth; in the one case locomotives, in the other case buildings. For the one the primary material is ore under the earth's surface, for the other the surface itself. Without ore there could be no locomotives, without sites no buildings. If these could be withheld altogether, all the capital invested and the labor engaged in the many industries involved in the production of locomotives and of houses would be deprived of employment, and both capitalists and workers starved. That is, opportunity, the one element necessary to freedom, would be denied. Any limitation of supply means limitation of opportunity. Natural resources, therefore, are just the opportunity which the Creator has provided, by

using which His children can feed, clothe, house themselves, and provide for their needs—that and nothing else. The ownership of these is involved in the ownership of land, which carries with it control of everything in, on or under land.

I use the term land "ownership," because though theoretically there is no such thing recognized in English law, ownership has been made real in the long period of our history, first by robbery, then by legislation and commons enclosure, and recognized as a subject of sale and exchange. Neither has it any moral basis. The only justification of ownership is that a man should possess what he produces, i.e., the fruit of his own labor, or such fruit of the labor of others as he has acquired by gift or by exchange for equal value of his own. But no man has produced or can produce nature's resources. These are gifts of the Creator, and morally no one man has more right to property in them than every other. But in fact ownership of Great Britain is vested in a mere fraction of the population. And, as we have seen, it involves the power to deny or to levy tribute called rent for the use of the opportunities nature provides, and to fix and limit the conditions under which they are used. In other words it makes the millions the tributories and subjects of the few.

If ownership of land were the same in essence as that of capital, and had the same economic effects, the evils I am probing would not exist. The capitalist as capitalist can only exist by helping labor. It is labor which employs his capital.

Not so the landowner. As landowner he lives on both without contributing to either, and frequently he profits more by preventing employment than by allowing it. As a small class, landowners hold a monopoly of opportunity. That is what men need, and the greater their need the more they can be made to pay for it. The greater the demand in relation to supply the higher the price. The more restricted the supply the more urgent the demand. Growth of population increases demand. Holding land out of use restricts supply. Both profit the landowner, who grows wealthy while he sleeps. Both bleed industry by strengthening the power to levy tribute upon it.

The history of housing will make this point clear. The housing problem is not a war problem. It has existed as long as the industrial system. At bottom it is a land problem. Housing has not kept pace with population because it has paid owners to hold land out of use. In this way artificial scarcity has been created, a land famine has persisted, overcrowding has sent up prices, created slums and made millionaires of the owners. Allowing only small areas to be developed where great areas were wanted has enriched them with huge rents or prices for the land used, and left still in their hands unused areas for which they can command prices made higher by the urgency of the need thus created. They thus thrive on conditions that, by undermining health and debasing morals, make the workers less efficient and less able to bear the burdens thus put upon them.

But this is only one effect, and not the worst. To prevent houses being built means to prevent men being employed. It is to deny the opportunity that makes for freedom and social justice. It keeps in dependence and perpetual helotry men who might otherwise be independent and free. Housing is only one example of a general experience. Exactly the same process leading to exactly the same results operates in every department of industry, and even the might of organized labor has only mitigated the evils, and will never do more until their cause is understood and uprooted.

Of course capitalists have not been slow to understand how they could become the masters of labor instead of its partners or servants. Nearly all great industrial concerns have now become landowners, singly or in combination. They have engineered wars to secure control of raw materials in Africa and elsewhere. They have bought land, i.e., the source of wealth, whether mineral lands or merely their factory or warehouse freeholds. That is, they have exchanged some of their real capital for the power to prevent others from obtaining the materials out of which wealth is made. Put in another way this means that they have exchanged some of their stored up labor for the power to keep the raw material of wealth from present labor, i. e., the power to deny opportunity to living laborers. This has united two forces naturally hostile, and thus increased the dependence of labor. The price paid stands as capital in their books, but the power to prevent others from making wealth is no more capital than is ungotten minerals wealth. Every effort is made to confuse the two, but they are totally different in nature. In this confusion lies the danger of continuing the old futile policy of dealing with effects instead of causes, thus perpetuating even when modifying social injustice, instead of eradicating it.

The true remedy is to keep the two things separate, and to force all land into its full use by applying to those who hold it the economic motive induced in capitalists by the wasting nature of capital.

The separation is quite easy, even when both elements are vested in the same person or corporation.

The land, with all that is in it, should be valued. The value once ascertained would measure the income that its proper use would yield. That, and not the income now derived from its withholding, should be taxed (i.e., taken for public use) to begin with at least as heavily as are the incomes derived from capital used in industry, and rated not less when not used than when fully used. There should be no exceptions.

Gradually the community should cease to take from the citizen by taxation values which, because he produced them, are morally his own, and instead should charge him as rent the economic land or opportunity value he holds, which, because they produced it, is morally their own.

The rent in the form of tax and rate should be levied (separately from the capital put on or in it by way of improvements), on every square yard within the four seas that has a value and can be used. This would bring the economic motive into active operation at once. The capitalist-landowner would have to use all his land, as already he has to use all his capital. Every piece of land not yielding the income of which it was capable would be a source of loss until put to its proper use. Holders unable and unwilling to use it would seek to escape the burden by selling or otherwise transferring the land. Every one using it would be compelled to seek the help of labor and of capital. With land and capital fully employed labor would come into its own. No longer dependent on one employer or one trade, every willing worker would have the alternative that means freedom. He could choose as his occupation the one for which he

was most fitted, and out of which he could get most satisfaction. Unemployment, except of the unfit, would soon disappear. Taking a job would no longer involve doing another out of one. Trade Unionists would not need to maintain their standard of life by denying others the right to live. Where service under another was unacceptable, or pay or conditions unattractive, self-employment would be possible, as an individual or in co-operation. Secure in being free to produce, each man would part with his product only for its value, i.e., he would get his natural wage. *Thus no man could exploit him for profit.*

Competition would no longer be what so often now it is, cutting one another's throats, for it could no longer deprive a willing worker of his livelihood. It could only take the form of healthy rivalry in which each man's success would depend on and be measured by his helpfulness. Indeed, under free conditions competition would become a form of co-operation. Industry would become a brotherhood instead of a warfare. Classes would merge into one without a class war.

The power of landlordism to plunder industry would be gone. So would the power of capitalism to dominate and exploit labor, its power only to help remaining. Huge fortunes and squalid poverty alike would in time disappear, except as the latter was due to idleness or incompetence. Character, capacity and service would supersede birth and money as titles of honor and marks of distinction. In a word, it would spell the death of privilege, and birth of Social Justice.

A Memorial to Jenkin Lloyd Jones

It is proposed to place a bronze tablet on the birthplace of the late Jenkin Lloyd Jones near Llandyssul, Wales. It is known that this would meet with the cordial approval of Welsh liberal ministers, together with the numerous friends of Mr. Jones in this country.

The undersigned appeal for the sum of $800 for this tablet. Following this statement is the inscription which it is proposed to place upon the tablet in both Welsh and English.

In this house was born, November 14, 1843
JENKIN LLOYD JONES
A kinsman in the third generation from that Jenkin Jones who preached his first Unitarian sermon at Wernhir in 1726. Brought up an American pioneer's child in the woods of Wisconsin, after serving in the War that saved the Union and emancipated the slave, he became a Minister of Liberal Religion, a Preacher of the Faith that makes Faithful, a tireless Missionary of the Principles of Freedom, Fellowship and Character in Religion. Organizer of Social Welfare, Champion of all that liberates and lifts, his devoted life left four great causes more secure on earth—
TEMPERANCE, PEACE, GOOD CITIZENSHIP and FREE RELIGION
A Brother-Man of Pauline type, he died much loved, September 12, 1918

The Committee in charge consists of William Channing Gannett, Frederick Lucian Hosmer, John Morris Evans, Louis C. Cornish.

Contributions should be sent to Louis C. Cornish, 25 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass.

Wells's "Outline of History"*

Of H. G. Wells one of his most caustic critics wrote some years ago: "If he could only bring himself to acknowledge now and then that ideas may be true and useful even though they have always been recognized as such, he might occasionally find the whole force of ancient traditions gathering behind him and supporting his advance into the future." There was point to this criticism; up to that time Wells had concerned himself much more with anticipation than with retrospect. But so devotedly has he now, in his "Outline of History," given himself to the far backward glance, so fully has he acknowledged the debt of the present to the past in nearly every field of human thought and endeavor, that one waits hopefully for that same critic to accuse him of neglecting the achievements of the present. As for the future, Mr. Wells proves in the concluding sentence of the "Outline" that he still thrills with his vision of the time when life shall "stand upon this earth as upon a footstool, and stretch out its realm among the stars." He is still convinced that man is but beginning his adventure upon this planet of his, "flying swiftly to unmeasured destinies through the starry stillnesses of space." He is still at times as hopeful as when, in "The Human Adventure," he wrote:

> We live not life as yet, but in millions of separated lives, still unaware except in rare moods of illumination that we are more than those fellow beasts of ours who drop off from the tree of life and perish alone. . . . Man still goes to war against himself, prepares fleets and armies and fortresses, like a sleep-walker who wounds himself, like some infatuated barbarian who hacks his own limbs with a knife. But he awakens.

This awakening seemed near at hand in 1913. Then the infatuated barbarian began to hack his own limbs with a fury that awoke in Mr. Wells a profound doubt of the triumphant issue of the great adventure. "The Undying Fire" eloquently voiced his fear that the adventure might fail. He conceived there of a Process very much like Hardy's Immanent Will in its utter indifference to humanity: a Process that creates good and evil blindly; that makes, destroys, favors, torments; that by accident has made for mankind a moment of opportunity. Unless man seizes upon life—his opportunity—and masters it, the Process may sweep him away, wipe him out as carelessly as he was made; "and something else will come, as disconnected and aimless, something neither necessarily better nor worse, but different, to be wiped out in its turn." The Process is just Chaos. "Man is the passing opportunity for order in the waste." But, he notes, the opportunity passes, while with extraordinary ingenuity and skill, with intellectual subtlety and scientific devotion, men elaborate such destructive devices as poison gas, and drift to this and other organized abominations "because their technical education has been better than their historical and social education"; because they have "lost touch with or failed to apprehend that idea of a single human community—that idea which is the substance of all true history, and the essential teaching of God."

Though the last words of the "Outline of History" are a courageous anticipation in the spirit of his earlier

*THE OUTLINE OF HISTORY. Being a Plain History of Life and Mankind. By H. G. Wells. Written with the advice and editorial help of Mr. Ernest Barker, Sir H. H. Johnston, Sir E. Ray Lankester and Professor Gilbert Murray, and illustrated by J. F. Horrabin. (Macmillan.)

hopefulness, a significant sentence that precedes them is an expression of his more recent anxiety: "human history is a race between education and catastrophe." Human life on this planet is a thrilling adventure. It is an adventure that may fail. That it may not fail, Wells has written his "Outline" to help his generation in the race between education and catastrophe. His greatest claim for his work is that of "the unity of presentation attainable only when the whole subject has been passed through one single mind." He is acutely aware of unavoidable limitations. The Record of the Rocks, for instance, has been studied for only a few generations by a few men in each generation, and many unexplored portions of the earth's surface have yet to yield up their secrets. The record of prehistoric ages written in man's brain is only beginning to be read by the newer psychology. Our ignorance of Eastern civilizations and languages results in great gaps and in little but speculation over long periods. (But Wells's effort to impress upon us the importance of these civilizations is almost a new thing in the writing of history.) The body of knowledge is nevertheless already vast enough, Wells feels, to document his working hypothesis of history, the hypothesis that "men form one universal brotherhood, that they spring from one common origin, that their individual lives, their nations and races, interbreed and blend and go on to merge again at last in one common human destiny upon this little planet amidst the stars."

So, under the guidance of Wells, to the story of our great adventure. It is an exhilarating story up at least to the opening of the Christian era. First, ages in which the earth spun hot and lifeless; ages of equal vastness when it held no life "above the level of animalculae in a drop of ditch water"; half or more than half of geological time elapses before life enters upon the age of fishes and amphibia. Early monsters of the ancient seas, clumsy amphibians, bat-winged reptiles, mastodons, and mammoths, "follow one another processionally to extinction"; there are conflicts, adaptations, predominances, dyings away, before the dramatic emergence of a rare great ape to manhood in a scene whose foreground is occupied by far more impressive creatures,—rhinoceros and mammoth and sabre-toothed tiger. The first slow advances of man needed long ages of progress under unimaginable difficulties. It is a thousand generations or so from the scattered savagery of the Stone Age to the first cities of a settled life in the sunlit river valleys of Mesopotamia and Egypt. And then for four thousand years

> this new thing, civilization, grew as a tree grows, now losing a limb, now stripped by a storm, but always growing. . . . After four thousand years the warriors and conquerors were still going to and fro over this growing thing they did not understand; but men had now (330 B. C.) got iron, horses, writing and computation, money, a greater variety of foods and textiles, a wider knowledge of their world.

These warriors and conquerors came most often from the nomadic hordes beyond the river valleys, free adventurers of the outer world, swinging north for pasture in the summer, south in the winter, moving in annual swings,

> as the broom of a servant who is sweeping out a passage swishes from side to side as she advances. From before the dawn of recorded history this region of human accumulation between the Danube and China had been . . . intermittently raining out tribes southward and westward. It was like a cloud bank behind the settled landscape that accumulated and then precipitated invaders.

The imaginative handling of these nomadic forces, in their spiritual as well as their physical significance, is one of the brilliant achievements of this "Outline."

Enthusiasm for the human adventure continues as we watch the growth of pictorial and sculptural record, of the verbal tradition preserved by the bards, and of writing, assuring continuity to the human tradition. Life grows more conscious of itself and its world.

> It is a thin streak of intellectual growth we trace in history, at first in a world of tumultuous ignorance and forgetfulness; it is like a mere line of light coming through the chink of an opening door into a darkened room, but slowly it widens, it grows. At last came a time in the history of Europe when the door, at the push of the printer, began to open more rapidly. Knowledge flared up, and as it flared it ceased to be the privilege of a favored minority. For us now that door swings wider and the light behind grows brighter. Misty it is still, glowing through clouds of dust and reek.

In the midst of an ever more complex social structure appears the free individual, the man with the leisure afforded by property to travel and study; and across the gulf of generations Wells greets a kindred soul, Herodotus, whose activity is a proof of the emergence of a new sort of people who ask questions, exchange knowledge, develop ideas.

> Beneath the march of armies, and the policies of monarchs, and above the common lives of illiterate and incurious men, we note the beginnings of what is becoming at last nowadays a dominant force in human affairs—the free intelligence of mankind.

Then out of a barbarous insignificant Semitic tribe, an unhappy little nation that persisted in trying to live in a narrow passageway between great empires—"like a man who insists upon living in the middle of a busy thoroughfare and is consequently being run over constantly by omnibuses and motor lorries"—emerges first the "free conscience of mankind." The Hebrew prophets begin to talk of the One God, and of a Promise that some day the world should come to peace and unity and happiness. From a temple religion of the old type, Judaism becomes a prophetic religion of a new type.

> Because of its persuasion of a promise and of a divine leadership to serve divine ends, it remained in comparison with Buddhism (its equal in pointing a way of life) bright and expectant, like a cared-for sword.

The significance of Jesus, greatest of the Hebrew prophets, lies, as Wells conceives it, in the revolutionary teaching of the Kingdom of Heaven—revolutionary as even we do not yet realize.

> It is true that he said his kingdom was not of this world, that it was in the hearts of men and not upon a throne; but it is equally clear that wherever and in what measure his kingdom was set up in the hearts of men, the outer world would be in that measure revolutionized and made new.

The great religions that arose between the Persian conquest of Babylon and the break-up of the Roman Empire declare by inspiration and insight the story that Wells believes history and science will presently display as demonstrable fact—the fact of our universal brotherhood.

Plato is the first clear anticipation of H. G. Wells. For Plato had the conception of a deliberate recasting of human conditions. He was the first to say to men —as Wells's God says to his Peter—"take hold of your lives, most of the things that distress you, you can avoid . . . you can do as you will with them. . . . Let us take hold of life and remodel it." And Aristotle, who marks the beginning of organized seri-

ous scientific inquiry, added "not a contradiction, but an immense qualification" to Plato—"Let us first know more of life." The adventure of Alexander, disappointing as it was, yet gave to men a glimpse of the possibility of world law and world organization.

Thus by the Christian era, three great ideas have dawned: the idea of universal knowledge, of science and history; the idea of one universal God of righteousness; the germ of an idea of a world polity, a human commonweal. Henceforth

> in every generation there is the evidence of men seeking for that better order to which they feel our world must come. But everywhere and wherever in any man the great constructive ideas have taken hold, the hot greeds, the jealousies, the suspicions and impatience that are in the nature of every one of us, war against the struggle towards greater and broader purposes. . . . Blunder follows blunder; promising beginnings end in grotesque disappointments; streams of living water are poisoned by the cup that conveys them to the thirsty lips of mankind. But the hope of men rises again at last after every disaster.

It begins to rise in the reader less readily, he loses the exhilaration of the earlier adventure, as he follows the story of the swift passing of opportunity after opportunity. Mr. Wells's frequent reassurances, as he analyzes the cause of each failure, come piping down the wind with less and less of power to cheer. Here is the new civilization of Greece—wrecked by planless and murderous squabbles, none the less planless and murderous though told to us in the prose of Thucydides. Here the opportunity of Philip of Macedon for the unification of the known world under statesmanlike leadership—wrecked by his early assassination; and the opportunity of his son Alexander—wrecked apparently by his inheritance of instability from his mother. (Against Olympias and her snakes, Wells displays an animus almost as marked as that against Cato the Censor.) Here is the experiment of popular government in Rome, failing partly for lack of two simple devices—printing and representation; and partly through loss of political *morale* in the insanities of the war to the death with Carthage. Here again, during the brief *Pax Romana* of the first centuries of our era, a splendid opportunity for the enlargement of knowledge, largely lost through the incuriousness of Rome, which respected wealth and despised science. (Wells admits a temperamental lack of appreciation of law and lawyers and a consequent unfairness to the legal achievements of the Romans.) The fresh, clean idea of Muhammedanism is presently wrecked through the squabbles and disputes that were the legacy of the Prophet's "carelessly compiled harem." And here are the great world religions, each becoming encrusted with diseases of the corrupt cults they sought to displace.

The story of Europe from the fifth to the fifteenth century is the story of how the great idea of the Christian Church—the idea of the unity of Christendom—failed of realization, despite many incidental achievements of value. Failed—why?

> The gory forefinger of the Etruscan *pontifex maximus* emphasized the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth; the mental complexity of the Alexandrian Greeks entangled them.

Intolerance of the symbols and poetic expressions of other creeds led to increasing dogmatism, and by the thirteenth century to a nervousness about heretics that made the Church act like a timid old lady, looking under beds and in cupboards for burglars.

> In a hundred market-places in Europe, the dignitaries of the Church watched the blackened bodies of its antagonists, for the most part poor and insignificant people, burn and sink pitifully, and their own great mission to mankind burn and sink with them into dust and ashes.

With the Renaissance came a tremendous expansion of human horizons, physically and intellectually; vast increases of knowledge; a glorious gift of new lands that, rightly used, might banish poverty; a presentation of opportunity to mankind "unprecedented in all history." And the nations, now in a phase of political retrogression under the influence of Machiavellian statecraft, received this splendid legacy as a fresh occasion for atrocious disputes. "But what community of human beings has ever yet preferred creation to conspiracy? What nation in all our story has ever worked with another when at any cost to itself, it could contrive to do that other an injury?" (It is at about this point that, on the basis of the facts presented to us, in this race of education with catastrophe, we begin like Mr. Floyd Dell, in the *Liberator*, to bet on catastrophe.) Again, across the disordered beginnings of a new time—the French Revolution—comes the raid of an "intolerable egotist," the adventurer and wrecker, Napoleon. Wells is curious about the Napoleonic legend: why do men admire Napoleon and strive to emulate him in their limited ways? Because he had a magnificent directness, a freedom from our intricate and painful moral conflicts, because he was what few men are or dare to be—"a scoundrel bright and complete." But he was merely an interruption, a reminder of latent evils. The significant history of his time is that of the mechanical revolution, revealing immense possibilities of mastery over substances and machines, and creating a "new gigantic material framework for human affairs," that involves fundamental readjustments of our social, economical, and political methods. Another great opportunity. And one of the first fruits of this mechanical revolution and the accompanying industrial revolution has been that economic imperialism, that new outbreak of lust and loot and hypocrisy, that led us swiftly to the Great War. Then to the Peace Conference, where three men were "mocked with the most tremendous opportunity in history," and allowed it to pass. The opportunities grow ever greater, the failures to grasp them vaster in their consequences of evil. Thus,

> the story of life which began inestimable millions of years ago, the adventure of mankind that was already afoot half a million years ago, rises to a crisis in the immense interrogation of to-day.

An immense interrogation, for one thing, as to Labor. Back in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries begin the upheavals that mark a new spirit of revolt against toil and subservience at the base of the human pyramid; phases of insurrection follow phases of repression, of compromise, of comparative pacification. There is a flaring-up during the French Revolution, again in the middle of the nineteenth century, an insurgency of vast proportions in our world. Back of the equalitarian doctrine of the labor revolt Wells sees the "unquenchable personality of Jesus of Nazareth." Either we solve the complex problem of co-ordinated toil and happiness by developing a system adjusted to the needs of the human soul; or our civilization is destined to disruption and replacement by some differently conceived method of human association.

THE FIELD

"The World is my country, to do good is my Religion"

THE ASSOCIATION TO ABOLISH WAR.

A real need seems to exist for a Society, not merely averse to war, which mildly opposes war in time of peace, but one wide as humanity in its sympathies, and openly radical in its aims, which shall oppose war all the time and never rest till war is outlawed from among men.

The experience of the late world war makes this proposition more obvious than ever. What have the nations gained from its hideous destruction? What else is it except the demonstration of the futility of all the old-world methods of violence to accomplish the aims of a righteous and sane civilization?

We believe that many who hoped that the great war would put an end to war are thoroughly disappointed, and that they may now be inclined to renew their faith in those ways of truthful openmindedness, of straight and sound thinking, and of friendly and unceasing respect for all kinds and conditions of men, which alone promise to put an end to war. We give hearty welcome to all who have ever been with us and we desire to hear from them and from many others of their kind.

Our program asks for much earnest endeavor, not only in outward effort, but also in candor and sincerity, in courage and independence, in patience and good temper, in public spirit and in intelligent breadth of vision.

We seek to obtain as many as possible loyal and interested members in every part of the country, in the hope of linking up our movement with every other such determined effort in every land. We need to organize a new preparedness against war on the part of humane and enlightened men and women in every community, who shall continually serve as a moral leaven in their urgency for the complete outlawry of war. War is promoted and kindled by fear, by reckless suspicions, by thoughtless nationalist talk, by believing evil of other people. If a few persistent and incendiary talkers and newspapers can provoke war, so the constant talking and writing of good-tempered and well-informed persons can put an end to war.

We need to advertise our purpose and to publish tracts for the times. We ought to have a working secretary who can devote himself to the prosecution of our enterprise. We need to hold public and private meetings throughout the country and to establish branch associations. For all this we need money in large or small gifts. Our Secretary-Treasurer is Henry W. Pinkham, 7 Wellington Terrace, Brookline, Mass., and our President is Charles F. Dole, 14 Roanoke Ave., Boston 30, Mass. Please

---

This interrogation at the close of the "Outline of History" is felt as a challenge to help combat the possible failure of the great experiment. Other histories do not leave us with this sense of an imperative challenge. They have allowed us to rejoice in the ornamental tapestries of history, the stories of Joan of Arc, of the Spanish Armada; and to bask in the art and literature of the Periclean Age or the Italian Renaissance or the Elizabethan period. These have been our consolations. With them we could sit like Cicero in the amphitheatre of history and not be overmuch offended by the gladiatorial combats in the arena. For it is recorded of Cicero (in a footnote) that, although he, like some other sensitive Romans, did not approve of the brutalizing gladiatorial contests, he went to them because of a sort of timidity or convention, but took with him his secretary and his tablets for literary work—and did not look at the fight. Cicero, as an early type of the pro-war liberal, should be lifted from the obscurity of that footnote to the prominence of the text.

Another reason for the imperative quality of the challenge lies in the keen sense Wells manages to convey of the humanity of all the actors in the great adventure: Paleolithic man painting by the light of his lamp a mammoth on the walls of his dark cave; Neolithic man, beginning the struggle with words, thinking about many things with a great deal of verbal confusion, and coming to some very odd conclusions—like ourselves; or sacrificing with impressive ceremonies his helpless human victims that harvests might be good and the tribe increase—as we do, on our vaster scale; the crowd in the Egyptian temple, waiting for the rays of the rising sun on Midsummer Day to smite down through the gloom of the long aisle of temple pillars, and irradiate the god above the altar; that disagreeable two-year-old child, Cato the Censor, running about a Tusculan farm-house at the time the eleven-year-old Hannibal stood before his father and took the oath of undying enmity to Rome. And so through scene after scene and figure after figure, vividly realized in their essential human quality, till we come to that picture in the well-lit room of the United Service Institution one December day in the London of 1919, and watch the field-marshals and generals gather to listen to Sir Louis Jackson dilate on the probable technical developments of military method in the next war—when fast-moving tanks, equipped with liquid gas, will obliterate every living thing beyond the enemy's frontier. The humanness of Wells himself is part of the impression. He is so passionately in earnest, so inexhaustibly curious, that we catch his earnestness, and join his editors in bursting into exclamatory and exasperated footnotes of disagreement whenever he lingers for a page or two in some field of knowledge in which we feel a little at home.

If in the end we decide not to bet on catastrophe, it is due to one other outstanding feature of the book: Wells's insistence at every significant point in the story upon the fact that we are only four hundred generations from the cave man. What can you expect of us? He notes, for instance, the recurrence of human sacrifice in Rome during the panic before the battle of Telamon. We have been reading of Roman history in terms of debates and measures, policies and campaigns, capital and labor; and then we suddenly come upon this horrible retrogression with a shock—as if a man went down to an unknown caller in his house and extended his hand "to meet the misshapen hairy paw of Homo Neanderthalensis, and looked up to see a chinless bestial face." So Wells tries to teach us patience, to keep our perspective accurate, to save us from too acute disappointment at the monstrous blunders, to make us

> Feel the far advance in looking back,
> Thence trust in the foot forward through the storm.

But we remember that with the rapid development of the mechanical revolution, the race between education and catastrophe grows ever swifter. As Vernon Lee writes, in "Satan the Waster," it is the pace, size, numbers, that give to all modern evil its vast crushing unwieldiness. The sudden enlargement of scale, the increase in geographical extension, in swiftness of communication, the tremendous increase in power over nature, in complexity of organization—"all this has been quite disproportionate to any increase in the spiritual capacity of dealing with these things." And there is danger that some day, when our Ciceros look up from their tablets, they will see Homo Neanderthalensis swooping down upon them, armed with atomic bombs—and the race will be won by catastrophe.

DOROTHY BREWSTER.

Schumann & Company

Cleaners of

FANCY GOWNS AND KID GLOVES

Having winter garments cleaned before storing them will keep out moth

PHONE DREXEL 231
ALL DEPARTMENTS

MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS
3954 Cottage Grove Avenue

It's a "Case" of Necessity

Your Printing will be above criticism if done by

THE OAKLAND PRESS

728 E. 39th Street
Phone Douglas 244

Phone Oakland 489 **JANITORS' SUPPLIES**

Everything in HARDWARE

AT

PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

WRIGHT & COMPANY

STEAM—DOMESTIC

COAL

TELEPHONE WABASH 5028

Main Office:
28 E. Jackson Blvd.
CHICAGO

Subscribe for and read UNITY —do not miss a single number!

write to either of them at least a postal card, giving us your own name and other names, and telling us your sympathy with us.

We hope to hold fortnightly meetings in Boston, of which notices will be given from time to time.

THE LYNCHING RECORD FOR 1920

To THE EDITOR:—I send you the following relative to lynchings for the past year. I find according to the records compiled by Monroe N. Work of the Department of Records and Research of the Tuskegee Institute that there were 56 instances in which officers of the law prevented lynchings. Of these, 10 were in Northern States and 46 were in Southern States. In 42 of the cases, the prisoners were removed or the guards were augmented or other precautions taken. In 14 instances armed force was used to repel the would-be lynchers. In 4 of these instances the mobs were fired upon and as a result, 7 of the attackers were killed and several wounded.

There were 61 persons lynched in 1920. Of these, 52 were in the South and 9 in the North and West. This is 22 less than the number, 83, for the year 1919. Of those lynched 53 were Negroes and 8 were whites. One of those put to death was a Negro woman. Eighteen, or less than one-third of those put to death, were charged with rape or attempted rape. Three of the victims were burned to death. The charges against those burned to death were: rape and murder, 1; killing landlord in a dispute, 2.

The offenses charged the whites were: murder, 5; insulting woman, 1; no charge except being a foreigner, 1; killing officer of the law, 1. The offenses charged against the Negroes were: murder, 5; attempted murder, 4; killing officer of the law, 5; killing landlord in dispute, 6; rape, 15; attempted rape, 3; assisting fugitive to escape, 3; wounding another, 2; insulting woman, 2; knocking down guard, escaping from chain gang and then returning and surrendering, 2; jumping labor contract, 1; threatening to kill man, 1; cutting a man in a fight, 1; for receiving stay of death sentence because another confessed crime, 1; peeping through window at woman, 1; insisting on voting, 1.

The States in which lynchings occurred and the number in each State are as follows: Alabama, 7; Arkansas, 1; California, 3; Florida, 7; Georgia, 9; Illinois, 1; Kansas, 1; Kentucky, 1; Minnesota, 3; Mississippi, 7; Missouri, 1; North Carolina, 3; Ohio, 1; Oklahoma, 3; South Carolina, 1; Texas, 10; Virginia, 1; West Virginia, 1.

ROBERT R. MOTON,
Principal of the Tuskegee Normal and Industrial Institute.

GERMAN PHILOSOPHER RETIRES

Professor Eucken of the University of Jena has retired at the age of seventy-four after a teaching career of forty-six years. He is still in splendid health and has an annual literary product of considerable proportions. He has often dealt with the problems of religion and one book in particular has circulated widely in America, "Can We Still Be Christians?" In his treatment of Christianity he left behind the formal confessional statements and his teachings have been accepted both by Roman Catholics and Unitarians, which is indeed some achievement.—*The Christian Century.*

The Community Pulpit

Sermons by
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
and
JOHN HERMAN RANDALL
of the Community Church, New York.
Subscription price, $1.00.
Address, *Secretary*,
61 East 34th Street New York City

Sermons now ready:

1. The Collapse of Civilization: Can Humanity Be Saved? (*Holmes.*)
2. Doors to Be Kept Open. (*Holmes.*)
3. Can We Still Believe in Progress? (*Randall.*)
4. Two Years After the War: The Vindication of Pacifism. (*Holmes.*)
5. The Great Society: How Long Can It Wear Its Old Garments? (*Randall.*)
6. What God Means to Me. (*Holmes.*)

The Blakely-Oswald Printing Co.

PRINTERS and BINDERS

Telephone Wabash 3854 120-124 W. Polk St., CHICAGO

Bowman Dairy Company

MILK BOTTLED IN THE COUNTRY

Milk Cream Butter Buttermilk

DO OUR WAGONS SERVE YOU?
WHY NOT HAVE THE BEST?

4221-4229 State Street Telephones at all Division Offices

EVANSTON CHICAGO OAK PARK